



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

plete material under the given topic." If so, there are errors. Thus three examples of the future indicative with *antequam* or *priusquam* are given from Cat. Agr. on p. 105, without an "e.g." But there are 4 (add 161, 2). Again, 7 examples of the subjunctive with the same connective are given from the same work. But there are at any rate 10 (add 143, 2, a second example from 53, and again a second from 113, 1). Similarly, p. 305, Bennett gives 6 examples of *dum* with the subjunctive from Cat. Agr. But there are 7 (add 103). On p. 97 he gives 15 for the number of examples of the future indicative with *dum* "so long as." But his own citations count up 16. They include Cat. Agr. 30, *usque dum habebis, praebeto*. To this should be added *usque dum habebis, dato, ibid.* (Further, *dum poterit*, 90, given on p. 97, under "as long as," seems to belong under "until," p. 98.) It is impossible to collect and handle so large a mass of material without mistakes. But omissions so considerable as these somewhat shake one's confidence. Yet they may all be due to some accident within the limits of a single general group of constructions.

The remaining chapters must be left without notice.

The book is very free from misprints. I have noted only *intercedit* for *intercedet* (p. 98, near bottom) and *argentum* for *argementum* (p. 35, near top).

WILLIAM GARDNER HALE

Index Verborum Vergilianus. By MONROE NICHOLS WETMORE.

New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Henry Frowde, 1911. Pp. x+554. \$4.00.

In 1904, Professor Wetmore published a Doctor's dissertation entitled *The Plan and Scope of a Vergil Lexicon*, a work which was widely distributed and favorably reviewed in various periodicals. In 1909, H. Merguet, the well-known compiler of lexicons for Cicero and Caesar, who had been sent a copy of the above dissertation in 1905, proceeded to publish a *Lexikon zu Vergilius*. It is a pity that the elder scholar had not indicated his intentions, for he would either have spared Professor Wetmore the trouble of preparing some thousand pages for the press or, by collaboration with him, would have produced something far better than the present *Lexikon zu Vergilius*. No law compels courtesy on the part of competing scholars; still, there is no law against it. Kalinka, in a not altogether favorable review of Merguet (*Berl. Phil. Woch.* [1910] 1038) expresses the wish that Merguet and Wetmore would join forces and give us a perfect lexicon of Virgil. But the time for such a wish was the past.

Despite Merguet's publication, Wetmore's *Index* fills an important gap. The old index of Erythraeus (1583), appearing after various revisions in Vol. VI of Heyne's edition, can no longer, after a century of work on the text of Virgil, hold the eel of science by the tail. Besides, it is extremely defective, especially in citing the minor words, whereas Wetmore registers all

the occurrences of every word. Merguet likewise professes to give "sämmliche Stellen," but one may wonder, after the example cited below, whether he succeeds. Besides the acknowledged works of Virgil, Wetmore includes those poems of the *Appendix Vergiliana* which can by any chance be genuine, namely *Culex*, *Ciris*, *Copa*, *Moretum*, *Catalepton* (including *Priapea*), *Dirae* and *Lydia*; the line is drawn just at the right place. Merguet treats all these works except *Priapea*, *Dirae*, and *Lydia*, but the omission of the first two is most untimely, as they have recently been claimed for Virgil with no little plausibility; the value of the *Lexikon* for investigations of the genuineness of the minor poems is thus distinctly diminished. The text chosen by both scholars is that of Ribbeck's *editio minor* (1895), but while Merguet refers, in a rather general way, only to variants in other editions, Wetmore records minutely and skilfully every important deviation in the MSS as well as the editions, and indicates by a dagger the presence of an unimportant variant; the user of the *Index* can feel sure, as he cannot from the citations in the *Lexikon*, that all necessary evidence for the text is before him. Word-headings are printed in the *Index* in small capitals if the form actually occurs in Virgil; otherwise italics are used. A figure following the heading shows how many times the word occurs in the poems treated. Under the word, forms are given in the order of the paradigm. Substantival and adjectival uses of adjectives and pronouns are distinguished, and so are the moods and tenses used with conjunctive adverbs. Set phrases are conveniently indicated, e.g., under *aut*, the correlative use of *aut . . . aut*; under *non*, such combinations as *non aliter*, *non dum*, *non iam*, *non minus*, *non secus ac*, etc. Useful classifications are given to meet a special demand; thus the combinations of *sic* with verbs of saying are grouped together. All this is done with great dexterity and accuracy. No human work is without flaws, so there must be at least some errors of citation in this; but the reviewer has found none, after a somewhat persistent search.

While a lexicon is, for general purposes, a more useful work than an index, this index, with its scrupulous exactness, is indispensable in many ways. In some cases it is even more convenient than a lexicon. For instance, there are two minor features of Virgil's style which had interested the reviewer for some time, and on which he consulted the *Index* at once. One is the use of a monosyllabic conjunctive adverb at the end of a verse in which the particle occurs in the first part; e.g., *Georg.* 3. 133: "*cum* graviter tunsis gemit area fungitur et *cum* | . . . iactantur." This is Lucretian (cf. 3. 221); in a very few minutes it was possible to discover, in the case of the particles *cum* and *dum*, that Virgil has the usage only in the *Georgics*, except for *cum . . . cumque* in *Ecl.* 6, the most Lucretian of the *Eclogues*. In Merguet the mass of citations with their classes and subclasses is effectually deterrent; in the *Index*, the word *bis* after a line reference assisted the reviewer to his goal in short order. Again, how often does Virgil employ anaphora of

the preposition at the end of a line? This is likewise a Lucretian device (6. 229: *per saxa, per aera*). It took only a short time to run down some twenty prepositions and find that Virgil has the usage only with *per*, and that this time the instances are all in the *Aeneid*. The author of the *Perrigilium Veneris* rings similar changes on *de* (l. 20), but this preposition is not so treated in Virgil.

An article abhorrent at first sight is *et*. One queries what use any reader of Virgil will find in the twelve columns of numerical references or the information that *et* occurs 3,159 times. An investigator of Virgil's use of *et* would turn to the text, finding valuable assistance in the classifications of Merguet. But the article in the *Index* is important too. For, first, we find separate treatment of the correlative uses, of *et*=*etiam*, and of phrases like *nec non et* and *quin et*. Further, it is no great task, with the references thus presented, to ascertain the relative proportions of *et*, *que*, and *atque* in the *Eclogues*, *Georgics*, and *Aeneid*, a matter almost as difficult to dig out of Merguet as out of the text itself. The reviewer will not claim authority for a rapid count, but the result seems to be that while in the *Eclogues* *et* is far more frequent than *que*, in the *Georgics* it only slightly preponderates, and in the *Aeneid*, *que* has distinctly the upper hand. If there is a real development here, further investigation of the matter might profitably be applied to the question of the genuineness and the chronology of the *Minor Poems*.

Other evidence on the same important problem should be forthcoming. Thus the interjection *a* (*ah*) is found in the *Minor Poems*, but not after the *Georgics*, while *aliter* occurs in the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*, but not before. *Itaque* appears only once, and that in *Catal.* 9, the only poem in that collection which Birt in his recent edition believed spurious. The instances cited mean nothing until the whole array of such evidence is presented and Virgil's practices in such matters are discovered, but we may infer at least that further examination of the material now accessible may yield significant results. If the reviewer is correctly informed, Professor Wetmore himself is contemplating studies of this kind.

Further, it is needless to say that the emender will be steered from many a pitfall by the *Index*. Supposing for the moment that *Catalepton* and *Culex* be proved early works of Virgil, Ribbeck's *pariter* (*Cul.* 3) seems dubious when we note that Virgil does not use the word till the *Georgics*. On the other hand, the *Index* may encourage the critic to boldness. As *ita* has apparently the same history as *pariter* in Virgil's poetry, we may incline to follow the inferior MSS and Ellis in reading *ista* instead of *ita* in *Catal.* 2. 5.

Of course such information will be accessible in Merguet's *Lexikon* when all parts of it have appeared. But we may query whether it is conveniently and completely presented there. For example, let us turn to *anne*, which

particle, as well as *an*, is not cited at all in the index of Heyne. Merguet has the following: "*Anne* s. *an* I, 1 (VI, 719, Copa 36) 2*a* (VI, 864) 2*b* (G II, 161) i.e., like II, 2*b*."

This does not look simple. Why does not the cross-reference suffice? If references to the text should be given here, it would save space to give them all and omit those to the subdivisions of *an*. We have to turn to *an* eventually, since the last instance (II, 2*b*) does not include a reference to the text; this is on the principle that there is only one instance under the sub-heading in *an*. Turning then to *an*, we find the instances (35 in Merguet, 37 in Wetmore) classified into I, direct; II, indirect; II being subdivided into 1 and 2, and 2 into *a*) and *b*). The sub-classifications are induced, if I have divined the reason, by the different verbs on which *an* depends; whatever the principle, it hinders, not helps, in so short an article as this. In Wetmore, after the instances of *an* alone, references are given for *an* . . . *an*, *an* . . . *anne* . . . *an*, *ne* . . . *an*, *ne* . . . *an* . . . *an*, *ne* . . . *an* . . . *anne*, which is certainly information worth having. It may be gathered from Merguet, but not completely. In both *Aen.* 7. 363 and 10. 89, *ne* . . . *an* occurs, but in neither place does Merguet include *ne*. *An* . . . *an* occurs in *Aen.* 10. 681, 683, but here Merguet omits the second *an* altogether. In *Catal.* 13. 35, where the text is most dubious, Wetmore indicates, after Benoist, that there may be an *an* in the line; Merguet does not include the reference.

Perhaps this article is not typical. The reviewer has worked through others, however, and has found in nearly every one some omission or false reference. None of these is serious enough to spoil the value of the article as a whole, but the sum of them arouses suspicion. Wetmore's references have stood the test in every case. Had his *Lexicon* been printed, the reviewer would use it first every time. It would doubtless assume the prior rank could it be printed now. But as Merguet's book, whatever its defects, is of undoubted value, Wetmore's material could be put to better use in a *Concordance* of Virgil. The reviewer believes, despite Wetmore's arguments and because of Merguet's practice, that for a lexicon, the "logical" arrangement is preferable to the "formal." The former involves a study of the meanings of words, and that is the chief end of a lexicon. A many sided and impressionistic poet like Virgil colors his words with delicate shadings, but categories of the definite could be established, and a general rubric include the indeterminate. But it is better still, if the material does not bulk too large, and in Virgil it does not, to let an author's words speak for themselves in the order of chapter and verse. The reader can then make his own studies of meaning or form, unimpeded by divisions or subdivisions.

E. K. RAND